

REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claim 12 is objected to because it is not clear how the seal can contact the housing bore or cavity. Appropriate correction has been made.

Claim 20 is objected to because the parenthetical claim status is incorrect. Appropriate correction has been made in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

Claims 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 15 and 20 have been withdrawn thereby rendering their rejections moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Tackett (US 5,531,513).

Applicant has amended independent Claim 12 to clarify that the seal simultaneously contacts the piston, the enlarged diameter of the housing bore, and the cover, wherein an outer rim of the cover also fits within the enlarged diameter and is secured in position by plastically deforming the housing such that it folds over a periphery of the cover.

Applicant respectfully submits that Tackett (Fig. 2) does not show seal (combination of 202,203) being fixed inside the housing bore by the cover (210). Instead, a collar (215) fixes Tackett's seal in position. Tackett's arrangement is different than the structure that is described by claim 12 and therefore can not anticipate claim 12. For this reason Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 12 is in a condition for

allowance.

Claims 13, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21-23 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 12 and are therefore believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 12.

Claims 12, 14 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sinnl (US 6,024,421).

Applicant has amended independent Claim 12 to clarify that the seal simultaneously contacts the piston, the enlarged diameter of the housing bore, and the cover, wherein an outer rim of the cover also fits within the enlarged diameter and is secured in position by plastically deforming the housing such that it folds over a periphery of the cover.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sinnl (Fig. 1) does not show a cover being fixed in position by plastically deforming the housing such that it folds over a periphery of the cover. Instead, Sinnl employs a cover 21 that includes a caulked connection 22. Sinnl's arrangement is different than the structure that is described by claim 12 and therefore can not anticipate claim 12. For this reason Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 12 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 13 and 21-23 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 12 and are therefore believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 12.

Claims 12, 14 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hinz et al. (US 2005/0146210 A1).

Hinz's piston seal (unnumbered in FIG. 5) does not contact the frame. Hinz therefore can not anticipate Applicant's claim 12.

Claims 14 and 21-23 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 12 and are therefore believed to be in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 12.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tackett (US 5,531,513) in view of Sinnl (US 6,024,421).

Claims 17 and 20 are withdrawn thereby rendering their rejection moot.

Claims 13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinz et al. (US 2005/0146210 A1) in view of Sinnl (US 6,024,421).

Claims 15-20 are withdrawn thereby rendering their rejection moot.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination does not provide all of the elements of the claim13 and therefore is insufficient for forming a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In particular the cited combination does not provide the elements that are discussed above regarding the rejections of Claim 12, from which Claim 13 depends.

Applicant believes that Claim 13 is in a condition for allowance for at least the same reason as Claim 12.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the claims as amended overcome the raised objections and prior-art rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edwin W. Bacon, Jr./

Edwin W. Bacon, Jr.
Registration No. 39,098
Continental Teves, Inc.
One Continental Drive
Auburn Hills, MI 48326
(248) 393-6405
Attorney for Applicants